

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action, the Office indicated that claims 1-16 are pending in the application, and the Office rejected all of the claims.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103**

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Office rejected claims 1-6 and 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,029,175 to Chow et al.

On page 7 of the Office Action, the Office rejected claims 7-9 and 15-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chow in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0088580 to Desai et al. On page 10 of the Office Action, the Office rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chow in view of Desai, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0078292 to Blumenau. Also on page 10 of the Office Action, the Office rejected claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chow in view of Desai, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0077340 to Forsyth.

**The §102(b) Rejection (Claims 1-6 and 10-12)**

The claimed invention, as claimed in claim 1, is a method of providing content to a mobile web browsing device from any of several different web servers, comprising the steps of:

- (a) receiving at a remote computer, connected to both the device and each of those web servers over a network, a log of data identifying content that has

been viewed by that specific device, the log being generated and sent by the device;

- (b) the remote computer identifying automatically without explicit user request any of that viewed content that has been updated and is therefore to be sent to the device;
- (c) the remote computer automatically causing only that viewed and updated content stored on any of the web servers to be sent to the device over the network;
- (d) causing that viewed and updated content to be automatically stored in device memory.

U.S. Patent No. 6,029,175 (Chow) discloses a network agent that intercepts HTTP transactions between a web browser client and an HTTP server. As described at column 4, lines 57 to 64 of Chow, a user first directs their web browser to an HTML page hosted by the network agent ("Revision Manager"). The HTML page, shown in Figure 23 of Chow, presents a form to the user through which the user can submit the URL of a resource in which they are interested. When the form is submitted by the user, the Revision Manager retrieves the requested resource, appends a second form to the resource, and transmits the form and resource to the user's web browser (see column 4, line 64 to column 5, line 1 and Figure 26 of Chow).

This second form, appended to the requested resource by the Revision Manager, allows the user to specify whether he or she wishes to receive alerts when the resource, stored on a remote HTTP server, is updated and if so, at what time interval updates should be

sent. The form also allows the user to enter the URL of a new resource that should be retrieved by the Revision Manager. This field is equivalent to the URL field of the first form and is provided in the second form purely for the convenience of the user.

As explained in column 5, line 64 to column 6, line 15 of Chow, if the user checks the “Alert me on source update” checkbox shown in figure 26, the Revision Manager will periodically check to see if the requested resource has changed on the remote HTTP server and, if a change is detected, the Revision Manager will store the updated document and notify the user’s web browser. On receipt of the notification, the web browser requests the updated document from the Revision Manager.

Finally, all URLs embedded in a resource retrieved by the Revision Manager are modified by the Revision Manager so that subsequent requests generated by a user clicking on a URL are routed through the Revision Manager (see column 4, line 64 to column 5, line 14).

At no point does Chow disclose receiving at a remote computer a log of data identifying content that has been viewed by a specific device, the log being generated and sent by the device, as is claimed in claim 1 of the present application. Contrary to the Office’s assertion on page 4 of the Office Action, the user of the device does not send the object of interest to the Revision Manager. As disclosed in the passage of Chow cited by the Office, column 5, lines 32 to 38, what is sent to the Revision Manager from the user’s web browser is (1) the URL of the desired resource, which has not yet been viewed by the device, and (2) a binary indication of whether or not the user wants to receive updates.

The Office contends that Chow discloses a “remote computer identifying automatically without explicit user request any of that viewed content that has been

updated”. It is respectfully submitted that this is not the case. Although Chow discloses that the cache of the Revision Manager is spontaneously updated when objects of interest have changed, for an object to be marked “of interest” the *user must first submit* the second form with the checkbox checked. Hence in Chow updated content previously viewed by the user is not identified without explicit user request – the user *explicitly requests* that the content be checked for updates when he or she submits the form.

Furthermore, the Office contends that Chow discloses “causing that viewed and updated content to be automatically stored in device memory.” However, as described in column 5, line 54 to column 6, line 14 of Chow, when the user’s web browser is notified of a change in an object of interest by the Revision Manager, it simply issues a GET request to the Revision Manager and displays the updated page to the user. There is no disclosure in Chow of the updated content being stored in device memory.

The Office also states that “the shared cache is equivalent to the device memory.” However, it is explicitly stated in column 4, line 23 of Chow that the shared cache is “in the Revision Manager.” The shared cache is not located in the device and thus the shared cache cannot be equivalent to the device memory.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 1 and, by virtue of dependency, claims 2 to 15 are patentable over Chow. Accordingly, the Office is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1-6 and 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. §102.

**The §103 Rejections (Claims 7-9 and 13-16)**

Claim 16 is an independent claim and thus is addressed first. Regarding claim 16, the Office contends that the “log of data identifying the content that is being viewed by the device” is disclosed by the “supplying the resource locator in the form appended to modified objects previously accessed” language in Chow. As explained above, the form appended to modified objects previously accessed allows the user to conveniently access a different resource without being required to re-visit the start-up document containing the original form. Thus supplying a resource locator in this form is equivalent to supplying a resource locator in the start-up form. In either case, the resource locator identifies content that is intended to be viewed by the device, not “content that is *being viewed* by the device” as is claimed in claim 16. Furthermore, claim 16 recites that the device creates the log of data, i.e. automatically and without user intervention, whereas in Chow the resource locator is entered into the form by the user.

The Office’s remaining objections to claim 16 are addressed by the arguments submitted above regarding claim 1. The combination of Desai with Chow fails to teach or reasonably suggest the invention as claimed in claim 16. Accordingly, claim 16 is also patentable over Chow and Desai, taken alone or in combination.

Regarding the remaining claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103, Applicant reiterates that since each of these claims depend from claim 1, and since claim 1 is patentable over Chow, all of the dependent claims are also allowable. Applicant notes, however that none of the secondary art cited by the Office (Desai, Blumenau, and/or Forsyth), taken alone or in combination, teach or reasonably suggest the elements identified above as missing from Chow

with respect to claim 1. Thus, their combination with Chow does not render any of claim 1, 7-9, or 13-15 unpatentable.

Accordingly, the Office is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 7-9 and 13-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

**Conclusion**

The present invention is not taught or suggested by the prior art. Accordingly, the Office is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the claims. An early Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this communication to applicant's Deposit Account No. 50-4364.

Respectfully submitted

June 10, 2010  
Date

/Mark D. Simpson/  
Mark D. Simpson, Esquire  
Registration No. 32,942

SAUL EWING LLP  
Centre Square West  
1500 Market Street, 38<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19102-2189  
Telephone: 215 972 7880  
Facsimile: 215 972 4169  
Email: MSimpson@saul.com